

REMARKS

No claims have been deleted, amended, or added. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8-11, 16-19, 24-27, 32-35, and 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lewallen (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,224) in view of Wugofski (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,143).

Claim 1 recites that a method for dynamically developing a user interface in an existing software application comprises invoking a user interface developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the software application, identifying one or more fields to include in the user interface, associating a field type for each of the identified one or more fields, and associating the user interface with a function of the software application. Claim 1 further recites that the method comprises saving the identified one or more fields, associated field types, and the association of the user interface to the function of the software application in a user interface definition file, and generating the user interface when the associated function is triggered based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application.

In the rejection, it is admitted that Lewallen fails to disclose or suggest creating a user interface and associating the user interface to a function of software application. Since Lewallen fails to disclose or suggest associating the user interface to a function of the software application, Lewallen necessarily fails to disclose or suggest saving the association of the user interface to the function of the software application in a user interface definition file as recited in claim 1. Lewallen also necessarily fails to disclose or suggest generating the user interface when the associated function is triggered based on the user interface definition file during execution of the software application as recited in claim 1.

Even if combinable, Wugofski fails to cure the deficiencies of Lewallen. Wugofski et al. discloses defining a GUI to control the functionality of an application (col. 3, lines 25-35).

In addition, the GUI can be redefined to control the functionality of additional applications or applets (col. 3, lines 40-48). When a user initiates a function registered in the GUI, any application or applet which is registered for the function is notified (col. 3, lines 49-57). Thus, after registering the functions of the applications and/or applets with the GUI, Wugofski discloses that the user selects a function through the GUI, which notifies the applications and/or applets with the registered function. A user is therefore able to control the functions of multiple applications with one GUI.

Accordingly, like Lewallen, Wugofski fails to disclose or suggest generating the user interface when the associated function [of the software application] is triggered based on the user interface definition file during execution of the software application, as recited in claim 1. In other words, Wugofski does not generate the user interface when a function associated with the software application is triggered. Rather, with the GUI already generated, Wugofski discloses that a user initiates a command to execute a function through the GUI itself, not the software application. Furthermore, the command to execute a function in Wugofski triggers a notification to applications registered for the function, not the generation of the user interface as recited in claim 1. Therefore, even if combinable, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Lewallen and Wugofski.

Claims 2-8 and 41-43 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Lewallen and Wugofski by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. For example, claim 43 recites that the step of associating the user interface with a function includes receiving a selection of the function from a list of functions of the software application. Wugofski, in contrast, registers all of the functions of the application with the GUI, but does not associate the GUI with a function of the software application based on a received selection from a list of function of the software application. Accordingly, claim 43 further distinguishes the claimed invention from the combination of Lewallen and Wugofski.

Claims 9-40 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Lewallen and Wugofski for reasons analogous to claim 1 as described above.

Lastly, claims 4-7, 12-15, 20-23, 28-31, and 36-39 were alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Lewallen and Wugofski in view

of Menachemi (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0103810). Even if combinable, Menachemi fails to cure the deficiencies of Lewallen and Wugofski. Like Lewallen and Wugofski, Menachemi fails to disclose or suggest generating the user interface when the associated function is triggered based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4-7 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Lewallen, Wugofski, and Menachemi by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 12-15, 20-23, 28-31, and 36-39 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Lewallen, Wugofski, and Menachemi for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7/22/05

By W.T. Ellis For Marc Weinstein

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874
Marc K. Weinstein
Registration No. 43,250
Attorneys for Applicant